



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/705,242	11/12/2003	Alan C. Lloyd	659-49	3554		
23117	7590	12/18/2008	EXAMINER			
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203				AHN, SANGWOO		
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER				
2168						
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE				
12/18/2008		PAPER				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b><i>Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/705,242 <b>Examiner</b> SANGWOO AHN	LLOYD ET AL. <b>Art Unit</b> 2168

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) SANGWOO AHN. (3) Alan Lloyd.  
 (2) Larry Nixon (Reg. 25,640). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 26 November 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: The inventor, Mr. Lloyd, explained the invention and the significance of it using slides.

Claim(s) discussed: Proposed claims were discussed.

Identification of prior art discussed: Harvey.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative Mr. Nixon and the applicant Mr. Lloyd explained what the invention is and how it is distinguishable over the prior art Harvey. Mr. Nixon and examiner also discussed newly proposed claims. Although no agreement was reached, there is a better understanding about the invention and how the newly proposed claim's features reflect the actual invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/Tim T. Vo/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2168
--	---